

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 4, line 30, it is not clear where the term "section 2" is referred to.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being improper form because claim 5 is a multiple dependent claim that depends from another multiple dependent claim 4 .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “information on each web service for each respective URL”. It is not clear whether it means each web service contains a list of URL or each URL is associated with multiple web services. Specifically, it is not clearly explained in the specifications. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ranger (US Patent No. 6301584 B1), hereinafter, Ranger.**

8. With respect to claim 17, Ranger discloses a method of spidering websites (Ranger: Col 1, line 37) comprising recursively addressing a URL for a non-HTML web service description file (Ranger: Col 13, lines 15-17 describes addressing a URL for a web service description file, e.g., an object or a content item, presented in a non-HTML, e.g., VRML, as in Col 13, line 51, where objects or content items are recursively

addressed, as in Col 14, line 1, for cross-network referencing, Col 1, lines 31-32), parsing said file to obtain further URLs for non-HTML web service description files (Ranger: Col 13, lines 15-17), and recording said further URLs (Ranger: Col 13, lines 45-46, wherein content templates, including references, such as URLs, are concatenated).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashley (US Pub. No. 2002/0038352 A1), hereinafter Ashley, in view of Ranger.**

11. With respect claim 1, Ashley discloses a method for finding TV Anytime web services (Ashley: [0003]) comprising querying a known address, obtaining a file from said address, said file having a predefined structure, and parsing said file to obtain information for TV Anytime web service description files (Ashley: [0011] describes querying a known address, i.e., identifying the address and transmitting information

thereto, and obtaining a file from said address, i.e., awaiting a reply. [0010], line 7 describes the replied files, i.e., the content access data, having a predefined structure, e.g., programme delivery control, for the TV Anytime web service description files, i.e., files include specification and recorder, as in [0010], line 6 and [0012], lines 6-11).

Ashley does not expressly disclose said information as the URL. However, in the same field of endeavor (i.e., web content management), Ranger discloses conditions to obtain URLs (Ranger: Col 13, lines 14-17 describes URLs for selected objects, which can be web service description files.)

Nonetheless, the URL is a widely used means for identifying a resource. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Ashley with the teachings of Ranger by applying the URL, as taught by Ranger, to the content in the content access data, as taught by Ashley, in order to effectively identify and select multimedia content, an objective of Ashley.

12. With respect to claim 2, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claim 1 above. In addition, Ashley further discloses receiving a CRID and generating a basic URL from said CRID (Ashley: [0010], describes from the received content identifier, which is a CRID, the generation of the address, line 1-3, which includes URL, as in [0010], lines 5-6).

13. With respect to claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claim 1 above. In addition, Ashley discloses receiving a basic URL (Ashley: [0011], line 5).

14. With respect to claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claims 2 or 3 above. In addition, Ashley further discloses wherein said known address is generated by taking said basic URL and adding to it a predefined suffix (Ashley: e.g., [0041]).

15. With respect to claim 5, Ashley discloses presenting a human readable portion of said web service description files to a user (Ashley: [0001], lines 5-7, while human readable portion of said web service description files is not explicitly stated, it is inherent that portion of the message must be human readable), said user selecting a TV Anytime web service and obtaining said TV Anytime web service (Ashley: [0018], lines 3-5, describes users obtaining the service, according to the access data).

16. With respect to claim 6, Ashley discloses apparatus for finding TV Anytime web services (Ashley: [0003]) comprising communicating means for querying via a network a known address and for obtaining a file from said address, said file having a predefined structure, and processing means for parsing said file to obtain information for TV Anytime web service description files (Ashley: [0011] describes querying a known address, i.e., identifying the address and transmitting information thereto, and obtaining a file from said address, i.e., awaiting a reply. [0010], line 7 describes the replied files, i.e., the content access data, having a predefined structure, e.g., programme delivery control, for the TV Anytime web service description files, i.e., files include specification and recorder, as in [0010], line 6 and [0012], lines 6-11).

Ashley does not expressly disclose said information as the URL. However, in the same field of endeavor (i.e., web content management), Ranger discloses conditions to obtain URLs (Ranger: Col 13, lines 14-17 describes URLs for selected objects, which can be web service description files.)

Nonetheless, the URL is a widely used means for identifying a resource. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Ashley with the teachings of Ranger by applying the URL, as taught by Ranger, to the content in the content access data, as taught by Ashley, in order to effectively identify and select multimedia content, an objective of Ashley.

17. With respect to claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above. Ashley discloses a human readable portion of said web service description files (Ashley: [0001], lines 5-7, wherein while human readable portion of said web service description files not explicitly stated, it is inherent that portion of the message must be human readable). Ranger discloses a display device (Ranger: Col 3, lines 23-25).

18. With respect to claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claims 6 or 7 above. In addition, Ranger discloses user interface means for inputting a URL (Ranger: Col 5, line 26, a user interface, and Col 6, line 50, subsection 224-5 for the data source, which can be a URL).

19. With respect to claim 9, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claim 7 above. In addition, Ashley further discloses wherein a user selects a TV Anytime web

service and said communicating means obtains said TV Anytime web service (Ashley: [0003], lines 4-6).

20. With respect to claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same as in claim 9 above. In addition, Ashley discloses storage means for storing the TV Anytime web service obtained by the communicating means (Ashley: [0003], lines 3-4).

21. With respect to claim 11, Ashley discloses a method for providing access to TV Anytime web services (Ashley: [0003]) comprising receiving a query at a known address (Ashley: [0010], lines 1-5, where the known address is associated with the resolution utilities), and supplying a file in response to said query, said file including information to TV Anytime web service description files (Ashley: [0010], lines 5-7; [0012], lines 6-8 describe the supplied file, i.e., content access data, and TV Anytime web service description files, i.e., files include specification and recorder).

Ashley does not expressly disclose said information as the URL. However, in the same field of endeavor (i.e., web content management), Ranger discloses conditions to obtain URLs (Ranger: Col 13, lines 14-17 describes URLs for selected objects, which can be web service description files.)

Nonetheless, the URL is a widely used means for identifying a resource. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Ashley with the teachings of Ranger by applying the URL, as taught by Ranger, to the content in the content access data, as taught by Ashley, in order to effectively identify and select multimedia content, an objective of Ashley.

22. With respect to claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claim 11 above. In addition, Ashley discloses wherein said known address is generated by placing said file at the entry point of a web site (Ashley: [0047], [0048] and [0049] describe http addresses, which can be the portal pages, for automatic retrieval).

23. With respect to claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claims 11 or 12 above. In addition, Ashley discloses wherein said file further contains information on each web service (e.g., Ashley: [0012], line 6). Ranger discloses for each respective URL (Ranger: Col 13, lines 14-17 describes URLs associated with objects, which can be web service description files contained in said information.)

24. With respect to claim 14, Ashley discloses a server system for providing access to TV Anytime web services (Ashley: [0003]) comprising receiving means for receiving a query at a known address, and supplying means for supplying a file in response to said query, said file including information to TV Anytime web service description files (Ashley: [0010], lines 5-7; [0012], lines 6-8 describe the supplied file, i.e., content access data, and TV Anytime web service description files, i.e., files include specification and recorder).

Ashley does not expressly disclose said information as the URL, a predefined structure that includes the use of WS-Inspection, and TV Anytime web service description files that include the use of WSDL and UDDI. However, in the same field of endeavor (i.e., web content management), Ranger discloses conditions to obtain URLs (Ranger: Col

13, lines 14-17 describes URLs for selected objects, which can be web service description files.)

Nonetheless, the URL is a widely used means for identifying a resource. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Ashley with the teachings of Ranger by applying the URL, as taught by Ranger, to the content in the content access data, as taught by Ashley, in order to effectively identify and select multimedia content, an objective of Ashley.

25. With respect to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claim 14 above. In addition, Ashley discloses wherein said known address is generated by placing said file at the entry point of a web site (Ashley: [0047], [0048] and [0049] describe http addresses, which can be the portal pages, for automatic retrieval).

26. With respect to claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reason as in claims 14 or 15 above. In addition, Ashley discloses wherein said file further contains information on each web service (e.g., Ashley: [0012], line 6). Ranger discloses for each respective URL (Ranger: Col 13, lines 14-17 describes URLs associated with objects, which can be web service description files contained in said information.)

27. With respect to claim 18, Ashley discloses a server system for supplying URLs for TV Anytime web services via a network (Ashley: [0010], lines 4-7, wherein a server system, i.e., a resolution utility, supplies URLs for TV Anytime web services, as [0003]) comprising receiving means for receiving a query (Ashley: [0010], lines 1-2), supplying means for supplying one or more URLs for TV Anytime web services in response to

said query (Ashley: [0010], lines 4-7), and storing means for storing TV Anytime web services (Ashley: [0003], lines 3-4).

Ashley does not expressly disclose categorized list in TV Anytime web services storage. Range disclose categorized list (Range: Col 2, lines 28-29).

Given the teachings of Range, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Ashley by employing the content classification scheme, as taught by Range, to organize the content for TV Anytime web services in order to effectively identify and select multimedia content, an objective of Ashley.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LI-WU CHANG whose telephone number is (571)270-3809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. C./

December 13, 2007

/Nabil El-Hady/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4152